

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending, of which claims 1, 2, 10, 12, and 35 have been amended by this paper as indicated above.

The Office Action objected to claim 2 because the claim ended with a colon rather than a period. As shown above, by this paper Applicant has amended claim 2 to replace the colon with a period. Accordingly, the objection to claim 2 has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to claim 35 by asserting that "temporal input fields" in the last line of the claim has ambiguous antecedent basis, in contrast to "the second temporal input field" recited in the fifth line which has proper antecedent basis. As shown above, by this paper Applicant has amended the last line of claim 35 to recite "the three temporally adjacent input fields" so as to have antecedent basis from the three input fields introduced in the preamble. Accordingly, the objection of claim 35 has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action asserted that the terms "high quality" and "relatively little" in independent claims 1, 10, and 12 are not defined in the respective claims and that the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. As shown above, by this paper Applicant has amended the preambles of independent claims 1, 10, and 12 to remove the terms at issue, which merely identified one benefit achieved by practicing the claimed invention.¹ Accordingly, the rejection

¹Applicant notes for the record that the amendments to claims 1, 10, and 12 do not narrow the scope of the corresponding claims or otherwise evince an intent to surrender any subject matter.

of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action further rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-15, 19, and 35-37 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, and 3 or 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,459,454 to Walters ("*Walters*"). In response, Applicant has submitted a terminal disclaimer, in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c), with respect to *Walters*. Accordingly, the nonstatutory double patenting rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-15, 19, and 35-37 has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Applicant notes for the record that the Abstract has been amended solely to reduce its length to less than 150 words in an effort to expedite issuance.

The Office Action indicated that claims 20-34 were allowed, and that claims 4, 6, 8, 9, and 16-18 appear allowable over the prior art.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 10th day of June 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
ERIC M. KAMERATH
Registration No. 46,081
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

KC0000002653V001